# Appendix E

Land Use Maps
for
Friant and Cross Valley Contract
Service Areas

## GIS Land Use Data and Analysis: Sources and Methods

provided by:

Endangered Species Recovery Program, CSU Stanislaus Foundation, Fresno, CA, on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation.

#### List of Data Sources

California Department of Water Resource land use data

Abbreviation: DWR

Dates of data: (1993 - 1998) More information on data at:

http://dplasp.water.ca.gov/landwateruse/landuse/ludataindex.htm

How it was used:

Primary data source

UCSB GAP analysis land cover data

Abbreviation: GAP

Dates of data: (1980 - 1995) More information on data at:

http://www.biogeog.ucsb.edu/projects/gap/gap home.html

How it was used:

Used to to further classify non-developed lands of the DWR data and fill in areas outside of DWR surveys

USGS 1:250,000 Land use/land cover data

Abbreviation: LULC

Dates of data: (1977 - 1980) More information on data at:

http://edcwww.cr.usgs.gov/glis/hyper/guide/1 250 lulc

How it was used:

Urban areas from this coverage where added to DWR data since it included many transportation corridors and industrial (oil) areas not included in the DWR data and to fill in urban values outside of the DWR surveys. The data was also used to further classify urban areas of the DWR, GAP, and FMMP data

California Dept. of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

Abbreviation: FMMP Dates of data: (1998)

More information on data at:

http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/

How it was used:

Urban areas from this coverage where added to DWR data to include newer urban uses and fill in land cover values outside of the DWR data survey areas.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory

Abbreviation: NWI Dates of data: (1998)

More information on data at:

http://www.nwi.fws.gov/

How it was used:

Used to to further classify non developed lands of the DWR data

### **Dataset Construction**

The following steps were taken with each data set:

- -Data was obtained for the project area
- -Data was mosaiced and dissolved by land use code
- -Data was projected to a common map projection
- -Land use values where reclassified to USGS land use codes (see table below)
- -Data source and year attributes where added to the data

Land use was assigned in the following steps:

A spatial union was done with the DWR and GAP data to show both the DWR and GAP classification for the entire project area and classified with the following rules:

- -Where DWR data was available, the DWR code was assigned
- -Where DWR data was not available, the GAP code was assigned
- -Where DWR data was the generic "Native Vegetation", the GAP code was assigned if it was an undeveloped category (rangeland, forested land, wetland, or barren). Otherwise, the DWR data retained a code of 30 (unspecified rangeland).

The resulting data set is designated: dwr\_gap\_i

A spatial union was done with the FMMP and LULC data to show lands classified as urban for the project area and classified with the following rules:

- -Where LULC and FMMP were both classified as urban, the LULC code was used since it has more detailed classification codes.
- -Where the LULC data was classified as urban and the FMMP data was not, the data was classified using the LULC urban code
- -Where the FMMP data was classified as urban and the LULC data was not, the data was classified using the FMMP generic code of 10 (unspecified urban)
- -Lands not classified as urban in either set were removed

The resulting data set is designated: lulc\_fmmp\_urban\_i

A spatial union was done with the above data sets (dwr\_gap\_i and lulc\_fmmp\_urban\_i) to add and enhance urban classifications in the study area, with the following rules:

- -Where the DWR data land use code was the generic "Urban" and LULC data was also urban, the LULC code was used to further classify the DWR data.
- -Where the LULC data was classified as urban and the DWR data was not, the data was classified using the LULC urban code
- -Where the FMMP data was classified as urban and the DWR data was not, the data was classified using the FMMP generic code of 10 (unspecified urban)

The resulting data set is designated: dwr\_plus\_urban

A spatial union was done with the above data set and the NWI data to enhance wetland classification in the study area, with the following rules:

-Where the dwr\_plus\_urban data was a non-developed category (not urban or farmland) and the NWI data was for a wetland, the NWI code was used to further classify wetland areas.

USGS Land use and land cover classification system for use with remote sensor data (Anderson, et al., 1976)

Level I	Level II
1. Urban or Built-up Land	<ol> <li>Residential</li> <li>Commercial and Services</li> <li>Industrial</li> <li>Transportation, Communications and Utilities</li> <li>Industrial and Commercial Complexes</li> <li>Mixed Urban or Built-up Land</li> <li>Other Built-up Land</li> </ol>
2. Agricultural Land	<ol> <li>Cropland and Pasture</li> <li>Orchards, Groves, Vineyards, Nurseries and         Ornamental Horticultural areas</li> <li>Confined Feeding Operations</li> <li>Other Agricultural Land</li> </ol>
3. Rangeland	Herbaceous Rangeland     Shrub and Brush Rangeland     Mixed Rangeland

4. Forest Land	<ol> <li>Deciduous Forest Land</li> <li>Evergreen Forest Land</li> <li>Mixed Forest Land</li> </ol>
5. Water	1. Streams and Canals 2. Lakes 3. Reservoirs 4. Bays and Estuaries
6. Wetland	Forested Wetlands     Nonforested Wetlands
7. Barren Land	1. Dry Salt Flats 2. Beaches 3. Sandy Areas other than Beaches 4. Bare Exposed Rock 5. Strip Mines, Quarries, and Gravel Pits 6. Transitional Areas 7. Mixed Barren Land
8. Tundra	(outside of species' ranges)
9. Perennial Snov	w or Ice (outside of species' ranges)

# References

Anderson, J. R., Hardy, E. E., Roach, J. T. and Witmer, R. E. 1976. "A Land Use and Land Cover Classification System for Use with Remote Sensor Data." U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 964, p. 28, Reston, VA.



































